



\$~61

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 4995/2025**

REETA GANDHIPetitioner
Through: Ms. Sanjan A & Mr.
Srikumar, Advs.

versus

SMT SANTOSH DEWAN
& ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Rahul Shukla,
Ms. Bachita Baruah & Mr.
Ramandeep Singh, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

% **ORDER**
28.07.2025

1. The present petition is filed against the order dated 05.02.2020 (hereafter '**the impugned order**') passed by the learned Court of Sessions dismissing the appeal filed by the petitioner under Section 29 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 ('**DV Act**').
2. The application filed by the petitioner under Section 12 of the DV Act was dismissed by the learned Magistrate by order dated 25.07.2019 and the challenge to the same was rejected by the impugned order.
3. Undisputedly, the present petition has been filed with an inordinate delay.
4. The petitioner seeks to justify the delay in filing the present petition by stating that she has been embroiled in multiple cases with the respondent which have been mentioned in Paragraph 10 of the present petition.



5. A perusal of the same ~~indicates~~ ^{reveals} that the petitioner, in the meantime, had filed multiple cases or was respondent in a few cases. It is borne out that the petitioner was constantly approaching Courts and was defending in the cases where she was respondent. The petitioner, in the opinion of this Court, therefore, cannot now take the ground that she had not been properly advised or was not in a position to challenge the impugned order.

6. It has been observed in a number of cases that the petitions are filed belatedly and the blame is put on the counsel for not giving proper advice. If such arguments are accepted by Courts, it would only tantamount to opening a floodgate of litigations, where petitions could be filed even after decades on the premise of ill advice or that the parties were embroiled in numerous litigations and were consequently unable to file the case.

7. In view of the above, I find no reason to entertain the present petition after a delay of more than five years.

8. The petition is, therefore, dismissed on the ground of delays and laches.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 28, 2025

“SS”